

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-33 were pending. In the Non-final Office Action issued May 11, 2011, Claims 1-33 were rejected. In this paper, Claims 1, 10, 22, 28, and 31-33 are amended; no claims are cancelled; and no claims are added. Claims 1-33 are currently pending. No new matter is added by way of this clarifying amendment. For at least the following reasons, the Applicants' representative respectfully submits that each of the now pending claims is in condition for allowance.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,308,703 B2 (hereinafter "Wright") and further in view of Knouse et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,185,364 B2 (hereinafter "Knouse").

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-18 and 20-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and further in view of Shah et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,430,524 B2 (hereinafter "Shah") and Knouse.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright, Knouse and Shah, as applied to Claim 10 above, and further in view of Ishikawa, U.S. Patent No. 7,200,272 B2 (hereinafter "Ishikawa").

Claims 3 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Wright, Knouse and Shah, and further in view of Levine, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0111852 A1 (hereinafter "Levine").

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright and further in view of Levine and Knouse.

After reviewing in combination the cited portions of Wright, Shah, and Knouse, and the arguments presented in the Office Action, the Applicant's representative submits that the cited portions of Wright, Shah, and Knouse, viewed singly or in combination fail to disclose or render obvious at least the following limitations of amended independent Claim 1:

As amended, independent Claim 1 now recites, in part:

employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device

Support for this clarifying amendment is found throughout the Specification, including at least at Page 15, lines 24-28.

Rather, the cited portions of Wright seem to disclose applying security policies that are determined based on security features associated with a mobile device and the location of the mobile device. See, Wright, abstract. Also, a review of Wright appears to disclose allegedly protecting resources by transferring encrypted copies of files to a client device when encryption is required. See, Wright, col. 22, lines 63-66. Clearly, the cited portions of Wright appear to fail to disclose employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 1. Instead, the cited portions of Wright appear only to disclose encrypting resources during transfer to a client device rather than employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device. Further, a review of the cited portions of Knouse appear to disclose shared secrets stored on a directory server used for encrypting cookies set on browsers after a successful user authentication. See, Knouse, col. 11, lines 18-20. Again, the cited portions of Knouse appear to fail to disclose employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 1. In particular, Knouse appears to only disclose encryption allegedly related to the encrypting cookies rather than employing the virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 1. Also, a review of the cited portions of Shah

appear not to disclose any matter related to encryption of files. Thus, the Applicants' representative submits that the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, and Shah, either singly or in combination fail to suggest or render obvious at least all of the limitations of amended independent Claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants' representative requests that the rejection of amended independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, independent Claims 10, 22, 28, 31, and 32 are somewhat similar to independent Claim 1 and have also been amended similarly. Thus, for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 1 the Applicants' representative requests that the rejection of amended independent Claims 10, 22, 28, 31, and 32 be withdrawn.

Additionally, the Applicants' representative disagrees with the Office Action's allegation that the cited portions of Wright, Levine, and Knouse singly or in combination disclose or render obvious each and every limitation of amended independent Claim 33, including at least:

As amended, independent Claim 33 now recites, in part:

employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device

Support for this clarifying amendment is found throughout the Specification, including at least at Page 15, lines 24-28.

Rather, the cited portions of Levine appear to disclose allegedly determining that the user is interacting with the supplier using some type of device which may be a cell phone, kiosk, or any other access device. See, Levine, Para. [0022]. Clearly, the cited portions of Levine appear to fail to disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 33. Importantly, a review of the cited portions of Levine appear disclose no mention of employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device. Further, as discussed above, the cited portions of Wright and Knouse also appear to fail to disclose employing a virtual sandbox at the client device to encrypt the resources

using an encryption key that is stored on a remote server device as recited by amended independent Claim 33. Thus, the Applicants' representative submits that the cited portions of Wright, Knouse, and Levine, either singly or in combination fail to suggest or render obvious at least all of the limitations of amended independent Claim 33. Therefore, the Applicants' representative requests that the rejection of amended independent Claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Moreover, since dependant Claims 2-9, 11-21, 23-27, and 29-30 depend from one of allowable amended independent Claims 1, 10, 22, 28, and 31-33, each of these dependent claims is allowable for the same reasons as the respective independent claims from which they depend. Also, since the separate rejections of these dependent claims are now moot in view of the reasons presented for the respective independent claims upon which they depend, a further refutation of those rejections is not provided here. However, the absence of such a further refutation of the rejections of the dependent claims in no way should be construed as an admission of the legitimacy of the rejections, but rather it is in the interest of brevity and expediting the allowance of these claims that a more detailed discussion is not provided at this time. Therefore, the Applicants' representative requests that the rejection of Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is now in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representative at the below-listed telephone number if it is believed that the prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby. Although only certain arguments regarding patentability are set forth herein, there may be other arguments and reasons why the claimed invention is patentable. Also, the Applicants' representative reserves the right to raise these arguments in the future.

A fee in the amount of \$130 is being remitted herewith for a one-month petition for extension of time pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17(a)(1). It is believed that no further fees are required for this Amendment. However, should the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determine that additional fees are owed or that any refund is owed, the Commissioner is hereby authorized and requested to charge the required fee(s) and/or credit the refund(s) owed to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Dated: September 12, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By: /john w branch/

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

745 Fifth Avenue

New York, NY 10151

(206) 336-5669

(212) 588-0500 (fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant